App. F. IX-4

Previous References

1931.
(Muzrai)

File No. 344-31
Serial Nos. 1-6

Later References

-Do- 347.
Muz Dept 1937-35

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Serial Nos. 6

Part B for November 32

SUBJECT.

Appeal re the claim of Chirchingi Narasimhachar for a third portion of Nokkaneeha of the Kitchen portions of the Sri Yoganarasimha Swami temple at Melkote

---

To.
Chirchingi Narasimhachar
no 843 of 24-11-32

Intimating that his appeal petition is rejected

Mem3 Appl. No 140 of 31-32

General and Revenue Secretariat

Mem3 File No. ~~72~~ 341 of 1931.

App. F. III—2]

Serial No.	
1	Petition of 31.1.32 from Chirichingi Narasimhachar Samidhi and Kitchen Pariharaka Sri Yoganarasimhaswami temple at Melkote appealing against the decision of the Inam Commissioner in Inam Appl No 25 of 30-31 on the file of this Court rejecting his claim for a third portion of Rowalseva of the Kitchen portion of the said temple.
	The petn is sufficiently stamped & an authenticated copy of the Inm's decision has been filed by the petner with the appl. petn
	As regards the merits of the case, it is noted that the appl has been presented in time, it having been presented on 19.9.31. Whereas the decision was announced on the very day i.e. 19th Sept 31 or [illegible] it was communicated to the petner by an Endt to her claim only recently on receipt of the records is noted for orders. The request of the petner for a stay order in the matter is for orders.
	For perusal before issue. No Stay order seems necessary.

NOTE—Contn Sheet

WIS 03653—G P W—50,000—8 7 30

17/2/31.

20/2/32 1st Member

17/2

17/2

17/2

17/2

Mem. File No. of 193 | General Secr

D. Dr. No. 1201 Dy 23.2.32 to the Dy. Comm forwarding appl Pln from Chinthunji Narasimhadhar for submission of the connected records — 2

Letter No 1011/31-32 Dy 19.9.32 from the Muzrai Commissioner submitting records received with the Deputy Commissioner's letter No 766/31 Dy the 10th instant along with his office File No Appl 25/31-31 — 3

Dy The enclosures received with the P. M. D are Taluk Records Records in Two suits pertaining to the offices of the S.D.O & the Dc. have not been sent here. The connected appl. File of the M-C's office also has not been received, the right it is stated to have left with the Dy Commr

Call for them 11/10/32

For orders

14/10

No S 980 Dy 15/10/32 of the Muzrai Commissioner calling for additional records in connection with the appeal case referred to therein

Letter No 1011/31-32 Dy 21/10/32 from the Muzrai Commissioner forwarding his office File No Appl — 5

SECTION * 14 OCT. 1932 GENL & REV. SECT.

General and Revenue Secretariat | File No. 3 | of 1932-3

Serial No.

25 of 30-31 in connection with the appeal preferred by Chirchingi Narasimhacharyulu

The order in S.D.O. of 31.3.29 on the subject was flagged R

When the matter came in appeal before the D.C (Vide Memo Addl 20 of 28-29) he ~~dismissed~~ on 31/12/30 dismissed the appeal upholding that the order of the S.D.O. is correct.

The following is the report of the Huzildar upheld both by the S.D.O & the D.C. reports.

"There are now three Adigemane Panchayats barawardars the enclosure of Chirchingi Narasimha Claiming 1/3 part of Adigemane Rokkavecha rightly belongs to the two barawardars only Can be accepted. The Adigemane Panchayats do not desire the assistance of the Swamis Sanidhi Panchayats & the Adigemane Rokkavecha may be ordered to be shared by the two Panchayatdars & it is this view that has been upheld both by the S.D.O & the D.C.

The entire facts of the case are as set forth in Memo Addl 25 of 30-31 on the file of the Dy. Comr.

claim from the M.C's decision that the appellant may come on the Banawanda to Kitchener Guidance & his claim — n.s

The Kitchener Rondeka vepela is inadmissible.

~~For orders if the case may be~~ posted for hearing —

Mr

The petr has evidently no claim — Any arrangement that might have existed between him & the Pandicherikkal was of a private nature and cannot create any right in favour of the petr. Orders are solicited if the case is to be posted for hearing.

8
7/11/32

(for Secy)
(2nd dr.)

10/11/32

I don't think it necessary to post it
The petn may be rejected

11/11

12/11

SECRETARIAT
10 NOV. 1932
No. 2805

...NG SECTION
18. NOV. 1932
...L. & REV. S...

Serial No.	
6	No 823 dy 24/11/32 to Chinchingi Narasimhacha Panchanda Sri Yoganarasimha Swami Temple at Hellade intimating that his appeal petition is rejected — Memo no 844 dy 26/11/32 to The Inspection Commissioner forwarding copy of the above and returning records received from him on the subject

BB
23/12

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

WD 70—GBPM—60,000—13-8-31.

File No. of 193 General S



OFFICE OF THE
1ST ME

IN THE COURT OF THE FIRST COUNCILLOR, MYSORE STATE.

M.109.

Muzrai Appeal No: 14 of 31-32 Muz

3/2/32

Appellant:- Chirichingi Narasimhachar, Sannadhi and Kitchen Paricharak.

Muz 341-31-1

Respondents:- (1) Kainkaryam Shalvanaranaiengar.
(2) Vombidavritti Krishnaiengar. (only kitchen Paricharaks, Sree Yoganarasimhaswamy Temple, Melukote).



Appeal against the order of the Muzroi Commissioner rejecting the appellant's claim to 1/3 of Rokkavacham of the kitchen portion of the Sree Yoganarasimha Swamy temple at Melkote.

Facts of the case are:-

(1) The appellants family is serving both in the Sannidhi and kitchen of the above temple from over hundred years right down to this day.

(2) Every year, two members of the appellant's family work in the above temple, one in the Sannadhi and the other in the kitchen, according to the Han-- chike Patti submitted to the Government by them.

(3) In the same kitchen two other paricharaks work along with the appellant, but they have no claim in the Sannidhi.

(4) From time immemorial the Rokkavacham and the other income of the kitchen department are equally being divided among the three members, Viz, one of the appellant's family and the other two Paricharaks. This is evidenced by the temple records.

(5) The case began when the appellants portion of the Rokkavacham was stopped by the temple authorities, when the respondents protested to give away the due share of the appellant, owing to jealousy

jealousy and hatred. On the Report of the Amildar the Sub Division officer decided that the Rokkavacham should be divided only between the two respondents. The Deputy Commissioner and the Muzroi Commissioner have also kept up the same view.

Causes for Appeal.

(1) Though the Baraward of the Sannadhi paricharak is in the name of two dayadis, both of them together will never work in both the places ie, the Sannidhi and the Kitchen, at the same time.

(2) Two of the Barawardars of the Kitchen and one of the Sannidhi Barawardars work together in the kitchen at the same time, and all these three are not dayadis.

(3) To give evidence to the fact that the kitchen Rokkavacham, that is now in dispute, was being divided among all the three equally, apart from what was due to the Sannidhi Paricharak, there are exhibited two copies of the Nagadi Jamakharch Patti of the above temple.

(4) There is no need to bring our name once again among the kitchen Barawardars as our joint ~~towards~~ Barawards are brought under the Sannidhi Paricharike item in different numbers. In the revised list though our name is not brought among the kitchen Barawardars, it is mentioned in the note that the Sannidhi Paricharaks must continue to work in the Kitchen as before. Because of this it is not justifiable to say that the appellant has no legal right in the kitchen and that he has no share in the kitchen Rokkavacham.

(5) A copy of the temple Baraward is submitted which establishes our right in the kitchen. Also a copy of the Muzroi Commissioner's order No: 2034-142-07-6, dated 29-5-1909 is ~~also~~ submitted which states that kitchen paricharaks are three

three,and they must all work and all of the three must enjoy the Male and Maryades. Peshkar's order of 1-9-~~1884~~ (913 is also submitted.

(6) The Government receive from the devotee, for each Abhisheka Rs 2-8-0,but they distribute the Rokkavacham only to those who work.

(7) So also the three kitchen Paricharaks were dividing equally the Rokkavacham of 2 annas 4 pies for supplying Seethodaka and Ushnodaka.The Amildar not knowing the local conditions and difficulties and also not looking into the temple records has unjustly decided,exparte,that the Appellant has no share in the Rokkavacham.

(8) The Rokkavacham is not given as an honour or gratis. It is only a remuneration for hard labour.

(9) A new scale need not be granted to give the share of the Appellant. The Appellant is not also an assistant of the two kitchen paricharaks and he is not to be in office by their good will.

(10) The Sannidhi Paricharak alone enjoys all the incomes,Male and Maryades that are due to his post. So also the Sannidhi Paricharak working in the kitchen along with the other two kitchen paricharaks ,enjoys the income,Male and Maryades with the other two kitchen Paricharaks.

(11) The Sub Division officer has not at all heard the parties of the case and he has entirely depended upon the report of the Amildar who has newly stopped the Appellant's share of Rokkavacham not looking into the Peshkar's report or the temple Records.

(12) Contrary to the present order the following is in practice even now.

Every day all the three Paricharaks,ie one Sannidhi Paricharak working in the kitchen and the other two kitchen paricharaks,get three cakes

cakes ,one each.

One every Prathamaikadasi day,during the cocoanut distributions,the three paricharaks get 6 cocoanuts,two each.

During Tiruppavitrotsavam,the three paricharaks get three Pavitrams,one each.

Lastly in the Tadāv Utsavam all the three Paricharaks get Male and Maryades.

Thus it is seen that the Sannidhi Parcharak who works in the kitchen is not a non entity,and he is as much a working element as the other two kitchen Parcharaks and he is no more than a Kitchen Paricharak so long as he works in the kitchen.

(13) Till now no share is given,to the Sannidhi paricharak who works in the kitchen out of the income, Male,Maryade of the Sannidhi Paricharak who works in the Sannidhi,which he gets by himself as the Sannidhi Paricharak. for.eg: Rokkavacham during Sēvārtha,Abhisheka and Sahasranama,Male and Maryade during Mahabhisheka and Krittikotsava;Six Pavitras during Pavithrotsavam, and seven cocoanuts during Prathamaikadasi. This is in practice from the time the Tastik was framed.

(14) Justice is not meted out to the appellant even though our right is vivid even from the statements of the respondents themselves.

(15) Copies of the temple records are not granted though the appellant has applied for it repeatedly.

(16) The orders of the Deputy Commissioner and Muzrai Commissioner,allowing the Sannidhi paricharak working in the kitchen, a share in the Rokkavacham of the Sannidhi Paricharak, for which he has not worked, and disallowing him a share in the Rokkavacham of the Kitchen paricharaks, with whomhe has worked jointly and equally,are apparently unjust.

For the above reasons the appelant begs that the court will hold an impartial enquiry into the

into the case,looking into all the original records as well as the certified copies in the file and the Peshkar's report,

that the rights that are now disallowed be restored to the Appellant.

that the expenses incurred unnecessarily by the Appellant be made good.

that the present order of the Muzroi Commissioner be kept in abeyance till the appeal in this honourable court is decided.

Date 31-1-1932

Two Rupees Stamp Paid

I beg to remain,
Respected Sir,
Your most obedient Servant.

[illegible]

63

In the Court of the Madras Commissioner
in Mysore

Madras Appeal no 25 of 30 31

Appellant. Chirachiyi Varasimhachar
pouchavak of Sri Lakshmi Varasimha
Swamy temple at Melkote

vs

Respondents 1 Sadasiva Varadachariyar
2 Krishna Iyengar

Appeal against the order of the Dy Commissioner
Mysore dated rejecting the appellants claim
to 1/3 part of Pothka Vetcha of the Ketchen portion
of the Sri Lakshmi Varasimha Swamy temple at Melkote

facts of the case

There are 2 sets of pouchavaks - one to work near
the Deity and the other in the Ketchen portion of the
Pushtakshin referred to above. The work of the 1st
set being perhaps higher, it has been usual for
one of the pouchavaks of the Ketchen pouchavaks
in their turn. The appellant was one of those who

On account of some d. for L

about his emoluments he
on 30-6-24 requesting that the Kottikalvetcha
of the Ketchen portion may be ordered to be shared
as usual equally among 3 men working there.
The perkkar whose opinion was called for stated
that the petitioner's request might be granted
as there was evidence in temple records that Kottika-
lvetcha was being shared equally among the 3
Ketchen purcharaks from 1902 to 1928. The
Amildar after recording the statements of parties
reported to the Sub Division Officer that there were
not 3 purcharak Brahmadars for the Ketchen
and the petitioners contention was not acceptable
and that the Ketchen purcharaks did not desire
that the assistance of the petitioner and recommended
that Kottikalvetcha of the Ketchen might be ordered
to be shared by the 2 Brahmadar purcharaks only.
The Sub Division Officer having approved of this
recommendation, petitioner appealed to the
Deputy Commissioner the Dy Commissioner rejected
the appeal. Hence the present appeal in this Court.

The contention of the appellant is that
purcharake near the deity is entitled the family,
that the Kottikalvetcha of the Ketchen is from time

CHENNAI 600 032

immemorial — rata from the temple
Seale was sanctioned, is being shared among the
2 Kitchen parichaaks and his family and
this is evidenced by the temple records, that though
these records disclosed his present claim,
justice was not meted out to him and that
his claim will be clear from the certified copies
he has produced (1) P. Jamakarch pattis dated -
11-5-1905 and 12-12-1908 (2) P. order no 2084 dated
142-07-8 dated 29-5-1909 and the perthai order
dated 1-9-13 and the Paravard P. January 1886

Appellant and the 1st respondent who were
present were heard on 19-9-31

order.

I think the Deputy Commissioner and the
Sub Divisional officer have come to a correct
conclusion in this case. The appellant is not
borne on the Paravard as a Kitchen parichaaka
and if he helped the two parichaaks working in
the kitchen it was as a private arrangement
and it cannot give him a legal right to claim
a share in the Kitchen Rokkanatcha

the costs of the Burawad pancharaks
appellant gets his remuneration a
Sannidhi pancharak.

The appeal is accordingly dismissed

Signed S Bramanaya
Asst. Commissioner

Copy applied for on 16.12.31
Copy ready 19.12.31
Copy delivered
No of words 520
Copying fees —12—
Copying fees —2—
Copied by V Varentamail
Compared by K Sampangi Ramiah

Copy

S Venkatachalam
Manager
Asst Comrs Office
4.1.32

Ex. No. 4
No 17

App. F. G. 9]

Misc 341-31-2

15

GOVT. OF H. H. THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.

GEN. & REV. SECRETARIAT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

Dole delivered

No. 1201/Misc/Encl on A.P. dt 23-2-32

The accompanying Petition / Registered Appl. No. 4 of 1931-32

No. 832 dated 31-1-32

received at the General and Revenue Secretariat from Chinnaswami Narasimha Chari Jamadoni & Krishnan Parthasarathi appealing against the order of the H.C. in Misc Appl No 258 of 30-31 on their file of this Court about the Appellants claim to a Third of Rakkabeedam of the Kitchen Portion of the Sri Yoganarasimha Swamy Temple at Melukote

is forwarded, together with its enclosures to the M.C.

.....

.....for Rule

The Connected records

By Order,

17/2/32

Secretary.

BANGALORE,

15/2/1932

[P. T. O.

WD 02048 -GPB—3750—8-8-28

ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರ್..... ....ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು

.....,ಹೋಬಳಿ

....ಗ್ರಾಮದಲ್ಲಿರುವ

.....ಗೆ

ಇಂಡಾರ್ಸ್ಮೆಂಟ್.

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ನೀವು ಗುಜ್ಜರಾಯಿಸಿಕ್ಕೊಂಡ ..... .

ಮುಕ್ಕುಮಿನ ಅರ್ಜಿಯನ್ನು..... .....ಬಗ್ಗೆ

....

....ರವರ ಬಳಿಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದೆ

ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು.

By Order,

Secretary.

C. 13]

6.

No. 1011/31-32 Muz 341-31-3

Encl 1 file

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER
IN MYSORE.

Dated, Bangalore, 15th September *1932.*

FROM S. P. Rajagopalachari, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
~~S. SHRIANNAIYA, Esq., M.A., B.L.,~~
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

To

S. Shamanna, Esquire., B.A.,
Secretary to the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore.
Financial *Department.*

1/2079

GEN. & REV. SECRETARIAT. 351 21. SEP. 1932 MUZRAI.

SIR,

With reference to your Memo No.1201/Muz. dated 22nd February 1932, calling for records connected with the appeal petition of ---- Chirichingi Narasimhachar, Sannidhi and kitchen Paricharak, about his claim to a third of Rokkavetcham of the kitchen portion of the Sri Yoganarasimhaswami temple at Melkote, I have the honour to submit herewith the records received with the Deputy Commissioner's letter No.766/31 dated 10th instant along with this office file No.Appl. ~~No.~~ 25/30-31.

The appeal petition with enclosures received with your Memo is herewith returned.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Muzrai Commissioner.

S 98
Mcg 341-31-4

15th October 1932

The

The Mucrai Commissioner in Mysore,

Bangalore.

I am directed to state that your office file No.Appl.25/31-31 has not been received with your letter No.1011/31-32 dated 19th September 1932 submitting the records connected with the appeal petition of Chirichigi Narasimhachar Sannidhi and Kitchen Paricharak about his claim to a third of Rokkavetcham of the Kitchen portion of the Sri Yoganarasimhaswami temple at Melkote, and to request that the same may kindly be forwarded early.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

For Financial Secretary to Govt.

mk.

G—1]

JECT .....

.....

.....

Section Mucy

File No.

Serial No.

Diary No. of letter replied to .....

No. 598

To

The M.C-

Sir,

I am directed to State that your above office file No AMM 25/30-31 ~~dated~~ has not been received ~~to have been sent~~ with your letter No 1011/31-32 dy 19/9/32- Records connected with the appeal petn of Chidambara Narasimhacharya Jamindar of Kittelem Panchayat about his claim to a third of Rokka Vedakam of the Kittelem portion of Sri Yoganarasimhaswa

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *193* .

Date of issue 15/10/32

Signed by V. B. Muddukrishnappa

List of enclosures .....

Copied by .....

Examined by .....

WD 71—GBPM—40,000—20-7-31.

~~Will received in this office~~
That the same may be
and to request you to be so
~~good as to Copy into the Journal~~
~~of the Same~~

Mr Secy Ct
14/10
for the Governor
Mr Dept

Gov Ct
12/14/10

M. C. 13]

No. 1011 Eva 1/32c.
31-32

GEN. & REV. SECRETARIAT
477
25. OCT. 1932
MUZRAI.

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER
IN MYSORE.

Dated, Bangalore, ... *193*

FROM S. P. Rajagopalachari, Esq.,
~~S. HIRIANNAIYA, ESQ., M.A., B.L.,~~
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

To

S. Shamanna, Esq., B.A.,
Secretary to the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore.
Revenue Department.

SIR,

With reference to your letter No. [illegible] dated [illegible]
[illegible] petition of [illegible]
particulars of [illegible]
office file No. Appl. 35/30-31 [illegible]
appeal before Government.

I [illegible]

Sir,

Your [illegible]

[illegible]

~~For~~ [illegible]
(absent from Head Qrs)

General and Revenue Secretariat,

No. 843
Mis 341-30-6

Dated, Bangalore. 21-11-1932.
24th

ENDORSEMENT.

To

Chirichingi Narasimhachar,
Paricharak at Melkote,
Sri Yoganarasimhaswami temple,
Melkote.

Subject:- Re. his claim to 1/3 of Rokkavacham of the kitchen portion of the Sri Yoganarasimhaswami temple at Melkote :-

---

With reference to his petition dated 31st January 1932 appealing against the decision of the -- Muzrai Commissioner on the above subject, Mr. Chirichingi Narasimhachar is informed that any arrrangement that might have existed as between him and the Paricharaks was of a private nature and cannot create any right in his favour. The appeal petition is therefore rejected.

By order,

sd. S. Shamanna
Financial Secretary to Government

D3 Mr RS

Memo,No. 844/Muz 3 9-2- 2 file

Dated,Bangalore the 24th November 1932.

Copy of the above is forwarded with compl
to the Muzrai Commissioner for information. The
records received with his letter No.1011/31-32
21-10-32 are returned herewith.

By order.

Financial Secretary to Govern n

22

endix F·G—1]

JECT .....

.....

.....

Section Mm

File No. 341 31

Serial No. 6

ıry No. of letter replied to .....

No. 843

To

Chirachingi Narasimacha Paicharah. Sri Yoga-Narasimhaswami temple Melkot

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the 193 .

of issue 22/11/32

ied by Muddukrishnappa

Subject: — Re his claim to ⅓ of Rokkavekka of the Kovelan portion of the Sri Yoganarasimha Swami temple at Melkote

With reference to his petition dated 31/1/32 addressed against the decision of the D.C on the above subject Sri Chirachingi Narasimachar is informed that any arrangement that might

List of enclosures .....

Copied by 21-11

Examined by .....

WD 71—GBPM—40,000—20-7-31

have ~~come~~ to believe
with the Paichanahs was of
a private nature and cannot
create any right in his favour.
The appeal petn is therefore rejected

B.O

17/11/32

For Secretary

Noted

Petn 4+1/- Encl 2 files. 24-11-32

Copy of the above as
forwarded with compliments to
the D.C for info. & action. The
~~remaining~~ records
received with his letter No
1011/31-32 dt 21/10/32 are
returned herewith

B.

17/11

Noted